

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117324 to Iwai, et al. (Iwai) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0169010 to Shoji, et al. (Shoji).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the antenna bandwidth enhancing slot directs existing electrical currents flowing in the metallized housing to take different paths to at least increase the bandwidth of the antenna by introducing multiple resonances. Independent claims 10, 16 and 21 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments can be found on page 5, lines 7-9 of the application.

Neither Iwai nor Shoji describe the introduction of multiple resonances. In particular, in FIG. 17(a), Iwai illustrates an example of a slot 506 that is a half-wavelength antenna, and in FIG. 17(b), Iwai shows an example of a slot 507 that is a quarter-wavelength antenna (see also paragraph 0299). Slot 506 of housing antenna 102b will radiate at a single frequency, and slot 507 of housing 102c will radiate at a separate, single frequency (see paragraph 299). Neither slot will introduce multiple resonances.

Referring to Shoji, the slit 17a of shield box 17 (see FIG. 8) will not produce multiple resonances, as the currents of the shield box 17 will not be grouped separately. That is, the currents may take slightly different paths in view of the slit 17a, but they all will eventually collect at the end of the shield box 17 (not at the edge of a bandwidth enhancing slot), which merely leads to a single resonance. As further evidence, Shoji simply describes the slit 17a as optimizing the characteristics of the

shield box 17 as an antenna (see paragraph 0036). It mentions nothing about the slit 17a generating multiple resonances.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the above claims are now patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any requisite fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc., Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 25, 2007

By: /Larry G. Brown/  
Larry G. Brown

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department – MD 1610  
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.  
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,834  
Tel: 954-723-4295 direct line  
Tel: 954-723-6449 main line  
Fax: 954-723-3871